APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,173	10/23/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030664US1	8343

45993   7590   01/05/2010
IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER
SHIH, HAOSHIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/05/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 October 2009_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
            application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _20091231A_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1- 18 are pending in this application and have been examined in

response to application amendment filed on 10/22/2009.

2.   The previously applied rejection under USC 112 1st and 2nd are hereby withdrawn

in view of applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claim 1 recites the limitation "a clipboard" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests "**the** clipboard".

5.   Claim 16 recites the limitations "the concatenated information **items**" in line 8,

and "the multiple selected information elements" in line 9. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for limitations in the claim.

6.   Claims 17 and 18 are rejected similarly as set forth in claim 16.

7.   Claims 1-15 are rejected similarly because of their dependency to claims 16-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by

Apperley (Apperley, "Breaking the copy/paste cycle: the stretchable selection tool") in

view of Blish et al. (Blish, US 6,177,939 B1).

10.   As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 16, Apperley discloses a computer-implemented

method comprising: providing a copier configured to allow a user to designate a

destination point or area in a first computer resource, and to select in a second user

interface to a second computer resource multiple information element in the second

computer resources (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.2; a destination area/sink field and source

area/tank fields are visually connected allowing for a destination first, source second

copy/paste operation of multiple information elements. For example, "64 - 9 - 366 0121"

in the highlighted area);

        Responsive to the user selection, automatically [copy] the selected information

elements into a single transfer buffer (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.1, sect. 3.3, par.7, lines 7-9);

information elements are copied to a clipboard as the user drags the stretchable

selection tool across information items 64 - 9 - 366 0212); and

        Automatically transferring the information items from the transfer buffer, to the

destination point or area of one or more information elements (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.1;

information items 64 - 9 - 366 0212 on the right, are identified and copied to the "Fax"

field on the left).

Apperley does not specifically disclose concatenating the multiple selected information elements and transferring the concatenated information items to the destination point.

In the same field of endeavor, Blish discloses concatenating the multiple selected information elements and transferring the concatenated information items to the destination point (col.1, lines 55-66, col.3, lines 41-46; information elements are selected from multiple locations are collected/copied/appended/concatenated to a clipboard memory and pasted to a destination location).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley and Blish before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the destination first, source second copy/paste interface taught by Apperley to include multiple source information selection taught by Blish with the motivation being to make multiple information selecting and pasting more efficient (Blish, col.1, lines 30-45).

11.   As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 17, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 16 above.

12.   As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 18, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 16 above.

13.   Claims 1, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by

Apperley in view of Blish and in further view of Stern et al. (Stern, US 6,807,668 B2).

14.   As to claim 1, Apperley discloses wherein the providing of a copier comprises

providing a destination-first, source-second element copier configured to allow a user in

a first user interface to a first computer resource to designate a destination point or area

in the first computer resource, and to subsequently select in a second user interface to

a second computer resource two or more information elements in the second computer

resource (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.2; a destination area/sink field and source area/tank fields

are visually connected allowing for a destination first, source second copy/paste

operation of multiple information elements);

Blish discloses Wherein the transfer buffer comprises a clipboard in memory (col.1,

lines 60-63; "clipboard).

        Wherein the concatenating further comprises, subsequent to the user selections,

automatically copying the selected information elements into a clipboard in memory

col.1, lines 55-66, col.3, lines 41-46; information elements are selected from multiple

locations are collected/copied/appended/concatenated to a clipboard memory and

pasted to a destination location).

        Apperley and Blish do not disclose wherein the automatic transferring further

comprises, upon attempt to automatically transfer the information items from the

clipboard in memory, intercepting the transfer to the destination point or area of one or

more information elements; and the method further comprising: performing a

compatibility check for each intercepted information element with the destination
computer resource by consulting one or more user-configurable compatibility rules to
classify elements as incompatible or compatible; for each incompatible element,
performing a compatibility handling action as defined by one or more conversion rules;
and for each compatible element, allowing transfer of the unmodified compatible
element to the destination.

        In the same field of endeavor, Stern discloses wherein the automatic transferring
further comprises, upon attempt to automatically transfer the information items from the
clipboard in memory, intercepting the transfer to the destination point or area of one or
more information elements(col.7, lines 25-30; a drag manager checks the capabilities of
the information elements before issuing a paste command);

        the method further comprising: performing a compatibility check for each
intercepted information element with the destination computer resource by consulting
one or more user-configurable compatibility rules to classify elements as incompatible
or compatible (col.45, lines 6-9, lines 31-34; "GetFlavorFlags" determines compatibility,
"GetFlavorData" determines data type, user uses the data returned from the functions
described above to configure compatibility rules);

        for each incompatible element, performing a compatibility handling action as
defined by one or more conversion rules (col.9, lines 40-57; "translation manager"); and

        for each compatible element, allowing transfer of the unmodified compatible
element to the destination (col.7, lines 60-64; col.9, lines 36-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of

Apperley and Blish and the teaching of Stern before him at the time the invention was

made, to modify the destination first, source second copy/paste interface taught by

Apperley and Blish to include an element compatibility manager taught by Stern with the

motivation being to copy potentially incompatible information elements to a destination

area (Stern, col.8, lines 15-3; col.9, lines 49-55).

15.   As to claim 6, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

16.   As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

17.   <u>Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Apperley, Blish, Stern, Tomm et al. (Tomm, US 6,560,608 B1) and in
view of Tsuji et al. (Tsuji, US 5,586,025).</u>

18.   As to claim 2, Apperley, Blish and Stern do not disclose invoking a rule

management user interface responsive to finding no existing compatibility rule for an

element to be transferred; allowing, via <u>the</u> rule management user interface, a user

action selected from the list of creating a new compatibility rule, deleting a compatibility

rule, and modifying a compatibility rule.

In the same field of processing data, Tomm discloses a system for selecting rules to
process data. Tomm further teaches invoking a rule management interface ("rule
editor") responsive to finding no existing rule for matching for an element to be
transferred (fig.6; "630", "640", "650"); Tomm also teaches allowing, via <u>the</u> rule
management user interface, a user action to create a new rule (see col.5, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of
Apperley, Blish and Stern and the teaching of Tomm before him at the time the
invention was made, to modify the system for transferring content taught by Apperley,
Blish and Stern to include an interface for adding new rules taught by Tomm with the
motivation being to enhance the usefulness of Apperley and Stern's system since the
added new rules "are available for subsequent [compatibility checking] operations" (see
Tomm, col.7, lines 61-62).

Tomm does not disclose deleting a compatibility rule, and modifying a compatibility rule.

In the same field of endeavor, Tsuji discloses a rule management user interface (fig.1,
"17"), a user action selected from the list of creating a new rule (col.5, lines 65-66,
"registration of a new rule"), deleting a rule (col.6, lines11-12 "delete the rule base"), and
modifying a rule (col.5, lines 67- col.6, lines 2, "changing a stored rule).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of

Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm, and the teaching of Tsuji before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify system for transferring content taught by Apperley, Blish,

Stern and Tomm to include the rule deletion and modification taught by Tsuji with the

motivation being to provide a customizable user interface for rules manipulation.

19.   As to claim 3, Apperley, Blish and Stern do not disclose invoking a rule

management user interface responsive to finding no existing conversion rule for an

element to be transferred; and allowing, via the rule management user interface, a user

action selected from the list of creating a new conversion rule, deleting a conversion

rule, and modifying a conversion rule.

In the same field of processing data, Tomm discloses a system for selecting rules to

process data. Tomm further teaches invoking a rule management interface ("rule

editor") responsive to finding no existing rule for matching for an element to be

transferred (fig.6; "630", "640", "650"); Tomm also teaches allowing, via the rule

management user interface, a user action to create a new rule (see col.5, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of

Apperley, Blish and Stern and the teaching of Tomm before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the system for transferring content taught by Apperley

and Stern to include an interface for adding new rules taught by Tomm with the

motivation being to enhance the usefulness of Apperley, Blish and Stern's system since

the added new rules "are available for subsequent [compatibility checking] operations"

(see Tomm, col.7, lines 61-62).

Tomm does not disclose deleting a compatibility rule, and modifying a conversion rule.

In the same field of endeavor, Tsuji discloses a rule management user interface (fig.1,

"17"), a user action selected from the list of creating a new rule (col.5, lines 65-66,

"registration of a new rule"), deleting a rule (col.6, lines11-12 "delete the rule base"), and

modifying a rule (col.5, lines 67- col.6, lines 2, "changing a stored rule").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of

Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm, and the teaching of Tsuji before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify system for transferring content taught by Apperley, Blish,

Stern and Tomm to include the rule deletion and modification taught by Tsuji   with the

motivation being to provide a customizable user interface for rules manipulation.

20.   As to claim 4, Stern discloses creating and modifying a conversion rule which

specifies performing an action selected from a group comprising converting a text

element from one format to another format, converting a graphic image element from

one format to another format, converting a video clip element from one format to

another format, converting an audio clip element from one format to another format,

converting animated image element from one format to another format, isolating an

element, isolating an element and transferring an annotation to <u>the</u> destination, isolating

an element and transferring a hyperlinked annotation to <u>the</u> destination (col.65, lines 4-

8; each compatible format (col.7, lines 26-30 defines flavors as different data types, it is

consist with the definition of data format) is listed via the translation manager (col.9,

lines 49-54))

21.   As to claim 5, Stern discloses performing a compatibility handling action

comprises performing an action selected from the list of converting a text element from

one format to another format, converting a graphic image element from one format to

another format, converting a video clip element from one format to another format,

converting an audio clip element from one format to another format, converting

animated image element from one format to another format isolating an element,

isolating an element and transferring an annotation to <u>the</u> destination, isolating an

element and transferring a hyperlinked annotation to <u>the</u> destination (col.65, lines 4-8;

each compatible format, (col.7, lines 26-30 defines flavors as different data types, it is

consist with the definition of data format) is listed via the translation manager (col.9,

lines 49-54)).

22.   As to claim 7, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 2 above.

23.   As to claim 8, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

24.   As to claim 9, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

25.   As to claim 10, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.

26.   As to claim 13, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

27.   As to claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.

28.   As to claim 15, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAOSHIAN SHIH whose telephone number is (571)270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

HSS